arXiv:1407.6283v6 [math.AT] 9 Apr 2016

A semigroup theoretic approach to Whitehead's asphericity question

Elton Pasku
Universiteti i Tiranës
Fakulteti i Shkencave Natyrore
Departamenti i Matematikës
Tiranë, Albania
epasku@gmail.com

Abstract

The Whitehead asphericity problem, regarded as a problem of combinatorial group theory, asks whether any subpresentation of an aspherical group presentation is also aspherical. This is a long standing open problem which has attracted a lot of attention. Related to it, throughout the years there have been given several useful characterizations of asphericity which are either combinatorial or topological in nature. The aim of this paper is two fold. First, it brings in methods from semigroup theory to give a new combinatorial characterization of asphericity in terms of what we define here to be the weak dominion of a submonoid of a monoid, and uses this to give a sufficient and necessary condition under which a subpresentation of an aspherical group presentation is aspherical. Second, it deals with the case of a pair of group presentations where one is obtained from the other by adding a generator and a relator which necessarily contain the new generator, and prove under a mild condition that if the bigger presentation is aspherical, then so is the smaller one.

1 Introduction

A 2-dimensional CW-complex K is called *aspherical* if $\pi_2(K) = 0$. The Whitehead asphericity problem, raised as a question in [36], asks whether any subcomplex of an aspherical 2-complex is also aspherical. The question can be formulated in group theoretic terms since every group presentation $\mathcal{P}$ has a geometric realisation as a 2-dimensional CW-complex $K(\mathcal{P})$ and so $\mathcal{P}$ is called aspherical if $K(\mathcal{P})$ is aspherical. A useful review of this question is in [34].

The problem is still unsolved despite of many efforts during several decades and it certainly lies deep. An indication to the deepness of the Whitehead problem is the connections it has with other major open problems in low dimension homotopy or group theory. We will

mention below two of them. First, a result of Bestvina-Brady [2] says that a positive answer to Whitehead problem would imply that another old conjecture of Eilenberg and Ganea [10] is false. This conjecture states that if a discrete group G has cohomological dimension 2, then it has a 2-dimensional Eilenberg-MacLane space $K(G,1)$.

Second, in [29] Ivanov considers the following situation. Suppose that $\mathcal{P}_1 = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$ is aspherical, $z \notin \mathbf{x}$ and $w(x,z)$ is a word in the alphabet $(\mathbf{x} \cup z)^{\pm 1}$ with nonzero sum exponent of z. He conjectures that $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x} \cup z, \mathbf{r} \cup w(x,z))$ is aspherical if and only if the group G given by $\mathcal{P}$ is torsion free, and proves that if this conjecture is false and G is a counterexample, then G is torsion free and the integral group ring $\mathbb{Z}G$ contains zero divisors. So the existence of a counterexample as above would be a counterexample to the Kaplansky problem on zero divisors which asks whether the group ring of a torsion free group over an integral domain can have zero divisors.

There is a large corpus of results which are related to ours and is mostly contained in [3], [4], [7], [9], [11], [12], [13], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20], [21], [22], [26], [28], [29] and [35].

In our paper we will make use of the review paper [4] of Brown and Huebschmann which contains several key results about aspherical group presentations one of which is proposition 14 that gives sufficient and necessary conditions under which a group presentation $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$ is aspherical. It turns out that the asphericity of $\mathcal{P}$ is encoded in the structure of the free crossed module $(H/P, F, \delta)$ that is associated to $\mathcal{P}$. To be precise we state below proposition 14.

Proposition 1.1. *(Proposition 14 of [4]) Let $K(\mathcal{P})$ be the geometric realisation of a group presentation $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$ and let G be the group given by $\mathcal{P}$. The following are equivalent.*

(i) *The 2-complex $K(\mathcal{P})$ is aspherical.*

(ii) *The module π of identities for $\mathcal{P}$ is zero.*

(iii) *The relation module $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P})$ of $\mathcal{P}$ is a free left $\mathbb{Z}G$ module on the images of the relators $r \in \mathbf{r}$.*

(iv) *Any identity Y-sequence for $\mathcal{P}$ is Peiffer equivalent to the empty sequence.*

The last condition is of a particular interest to us. By definition, a Y-sequence for $\mathcal{P}$ is a finite (possibly empty) sequence of the form $({}^{u_1}r_1)^{\varepsilon_1}, ..., ({}^{u_n}r_n)^{\varepsilon_n})$ where $r \in \mathbf{r}$, u is a word from the free group F over $\mathbf{x}$ and $\varepsilon = \pm 1$. A Y-sequence $({}^{u_1}r_1)^{\varepsilon_1}, ..., ({}^{u_n}r_n)^{\varepsilon_n})$ is called an identity Y-sequence if it is either empty or if $\prod_{i=1,n} u_i r_i^{\varepsilon_i} u_i^{-1} = 1$ in F. The definition of Peiffer equivalence is based on Peiffer operations on Y-sequences and reads as follows.

(i) An *elementary Peiffer exchange* replaces an adjacent pair $({}^{u}r)^{\varepsilon}, ({}^{v}s)^{\delta})$ in a Y-sequence by either $({}^{ur^{\varepsilon}u^{-1}v}s)^{\delta}, ({}^{u}r)^{\varepsilon})$, or by $({}^{v}s)^{\delta}, ({}^{vs^{-\delta}v^{-1}u}r)^{\varepsilon})$.

(ii) A *Peiffer deletion* deletes an adjacent pair $({}^{u}r)^{\varepsilon}, ({}^{u}r)^{-\varepsilon})$ in a Y-sequence.

(iii) A *Peiffer insertion* is the inverse of the Peiffer deletion.

The equivalence relation on the set of Y-sequences generated by the above operations is called *Peiffer equivalence*. Given an identity Y-sequence d which is equivalent to the empty sequence 1, we would be interested to know what kind of insertions $((^ur)^\varepsilon, (^ur)^{-\varepsilon})$ are used along the way of transforming d to 1. It is obvious that keeping track of that information is vital to tackle the Whitehead problem.

The aim of Section 4 of the present paper is to offer an alternative way in dealing with the asphericity of a group presentation $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$ by considering the free crossed module $(\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon), F, \tilde{\theta})$ over F on symbols of the form $(^ur)^\varepsilon$ where $\varepsilon = \pm 1$. The advantage of working with $\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon)$ is that unlike to H/P, in $\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon)$ the images of insertions $((^ur)^\varepsilon, (^ur)^{-\varepsilon})$ do not cancel out and this enables us to express the asphericity in terms of such insertions. This is realized by considering the kernel $\tilde{\Pi}$ of $\tilde{\theta}$ which is the analogue of the module π of identities for $\mathcal{P}$ in the standard theory and is not trivial when $\mathcal{P}$ is aspherical. We call $\tilde{\Pi}$ the generalized module of identities for $\mathcal{P}$. This approach turns out to be useful when we discuss in Section 5 the asphericity of a subpresentation $\mathcal{P}_1 = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}_1)$ of an aspherical presentation $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$ where $\mathbf{r}_1$ differs from $\mathbf{r}$ from a single defining relation r_0. The characterization we give in this section for the asphericity of $\mathcal{P}_1$ splits the search for the asphericity into two problems, one is to look for the isomorphism of two certain groups arising from the respective generalized modules for $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}_1$, and the other is to prove that only a certain type of identity sequences for $\mathcal{P}_1$ are Peiffer equivalent to the empty sequence.

To prove our results we apply techniques from the theory of semigroup actions and to this end we use concepts like the universal enveloping group $\mathcal{G}(S)$ of a given semigroup S, the dominion of a subsemigroup U of a semigroup S and the tensor product of semigroup actions. These concepts are explained, with references, in Section 3.

In Section 6 we are interested in pairs of presentations $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x} \cup z, \mathbf{r} \cup w(x, z))$ and $\mathcal{P}_1 = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$ where $\mathbf{r}$ is a subset of the free group $FG(\mathbf{x})$ on $\mathbf{x}$, $w(x, z)$ is a word of the free group $FG(\mathbf{x} \cup z)$ on $\mathbf{x} \cup z$ necessarily containing z, and prove that $\mathcal{P}_1$ is aspherical whenever $\mathcal{P}$ is aspherical and $FG(\mathbf{x} \cup z)$ decomposes as a semidirect product $N_0 \rtimes FG(\mathbf{x})$ where N_0 is the normal closure of $w(x, z)$ in the free group and the action of $FG(\mathbf{x})$ on N_0 is by conjugation, thus proving the Whitehead asphericity problem at least in this particular situation. The study of pairs of presentations $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}_1$ has attracted a lot of attention. As we mentioned before, they are interesting in particular due to the connection between the asphericity of both $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}_1$, torsion in the group given by $\mathcal{P}$ and the Kaplansky problem on zero divisors. Problems regarding the asphericity and other properties of such pairs are studied from Bogley and Pride in [3] in terms of relative presentations.

2 Crossed modules and their semidirect products

We start by giving the definition of the free crossed module $(H/P, F, \delta)$ associated to a group presentation $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$ which can be found in [4]. Related to the given data for $\mathcal{P}$, we consider H the free group on the set Y of symbols ^ur where $r \in \mathbf{r}$ and $u \in F$ and $F = FG(\mathbf{x})$ is the free group on $\mathbf{x}$. Along with H we consider the free monoid $FM(Y \cup Y^{-1})$ generated by the set $Y \cup Y^{-1}$ where Y^{-1} is made of symbols $(^ur)^{-1}$ where $^ur \in Y$. The elements of

$FM(Y \cup Y^{-1})$ are called *Y-sequences*. Note that H is an epimorphic image of $FM(Y \cup Y^{-1})$ where the epimorphism $\gamma : FM(Y \cup Y^{-1}) \to H$ maps $({}^u r)^\varepsilon$ to $({}^u r)^\varepsilon$. Clearly any word of the form $(({}^u r)^\varepsilon, ({}^u r)^{-\varepsilon})$ is mapped to 1 under γ. Let $\theta : H \to FG(\mathbf{x})$ be the homomorphism defined by $\theta({}^u r) = uru^{-1}$. The elements of $Ker(\theta\gamma)$ are called the *identity Y-sequences*. Further, let P be the *Peiffer subgroup* of H which by definition is the normal subgroup generated by all the elements of the form $aba^{-1}({}^{\theta(a)}b)^{-1}$ with $a, b \in Y$. The homomorphism θ induces another homomorphism $\delta : H/P \to F$ which satisfies the following properties:

(i) $\delta({}^u c) = u\delta(c)u^{-1}$ for all $c \in H/P$ and $u \in F$;

(ii) $cdc^{-1} = {}^{\delta(c)}d$, for all $c, d \in H/P$.

With these properties the triple $(H/P, F, \delta)$ becomes a crossed module over F that is in addition free with base the map $\mathbf{r} \to H/P$ that sends $r \mapsto rP$. The kernel π of δ is called *the module of identities for $\mathcal{P}$*.

For further reading the reader is referred to the book [6] which is the best source for many interesting properties of crossed modules, and to chapters 2 and 4 of [14] which contains several interesting connections between crossed modules and the Whitehead's asphericity question.

To prove our result of section 6 we need from [31] the notion of the semidirect product of two crossed modules. Here are the details necessary for the definition. For a crossed module (T, G, ∂) we denote by $\mathrm{Aut}(T, G, \partial)$ the group of automorphisms of (T, G, ∂) and by $\mathrm{Der}(G, T)$ the set of all derivations from G to T, that is maps $d : G \to T$ such that for all $x, y \in G$,

$$d(xy) = d(x)\ {}^x d(y).$$

Each such derivation d defines automorphisms σ and τ of G and T respectively given by

$$\sigma(x) = \partial d(x)x \text{ and } \tau(t) = d\partial(t)t. \tag{1}$$

$\mathrm{Der}(G, T)$ becomes a monoid (with identity the trivial derivation) if we define the product $d_1 \circ d_2 = d$ where

$$d(x) = d_1(\sigma_2(x))d_2(x) = \tau_1(d_2(x))d_1(x). \tag{2}$$

We let $\mathrm{D}(G, T)$ the group of units of $\mathrm{Der}(G, T)$ whose derivations are called the regular derivations and sometimes $\mathrm{D}(G, T)$ is called the Whitehead group. There is a homomorphism $\Delta : \mathrm{D}(G, T) \to \mathrm{Aut}(T, G, \partial)$ defined by $\Delta(d) = \langle \tau, \sigma \rangle$ and there is an action of $\mathrm{Aut}(T, G, \partial)$ on $\mathrm{D}(G, T)$ defined by ${}^{\langle \tau, \sigma \rangle} d = \tau d \sigma^{-1}$. With this action, $(\mathrm{D}(G, T), \mathrm{Aut}(T, G, \partial), \Delta)$ becomes a crossed module which is called the actor crossed module $\mathcal{A}(T, G, \partial)$ of (T, G, ∂). Suppose now that we are given two crossed modules (M, P, μ) and (T, G, ∂) and that the first acts on the second which means that there is a morphism of crossed modules (a commutative diagram of groups)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{\quad\mu\quad} & P \\ {\scriptstyle\eta}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\rho} \\ \mathrm{D}(G, T) & \xrightarrow[\Delta]{} & \mathrm{Aut}(T, G, \partial) \end{array}$$

Suppose that ρ has components $\rho_1 : P \to \mathrm{Aut}(T)$ and $\rho_2 : P \to \mathrm{Aut}(G)$, that is to say $\rho(p) = \langle \rho_1(p), \rho_2(p) \rangle$ for all $p \in P$. Then M acts on T via $\rho_1 \mu$ and with this action we can form the semidirect product of groups $T \rtimes M$. Likewise, since P acts on G via ρ_2, we can form the semidirect product $G \rtimes P$. With these data one can define an action of $G \rtimes P$ on $T \rtimes M$ by

$$ {}^{(g,p)}(t, m) = \left({}^{g}({}^{p}t)(\eta({}^{p}m)(g))^{-1},\ {}^{p}m \right). \tag{3} $$

The map $\pi : T \rtimes M \to G \rtimes P$ given by $(t, m) \mapsto (\partial(t), \mu(m))$ is a homomorphism. With the action just defined the triple $(T \rtimes M, G \rtimes P, \pi)$ is a crossed module called the semidirect product crossed module relative to $\langle \eta, \rho \rangle$ and denoted by $(T, G, \partial) \rtimes_{\langle \eta, \rho \rangle} (M, P, \mu)$.

3 Monoid actions

For the benefit of the reader not familiar with monoid actions we will list below some basic notions and results that are used in the paper. For further results on the subject the reader may consult the monograph [23]. Given S a monoid with identity element 1 and X a nonempty set, we say that X is a *left S-system* if there is an action $(s, x) \mapsto sx$ from $S \times X$ into X with the properties

$$ \begin{aligned} (st)x &= s(tx) \text{ for all } s, t \in S \text{ and } x \in X, \\ 1x &= x \text{ for all } x \in X. \end{aligned} $$

Right S-systems are defined analogously in the obvious way. Given S and T (not necessarily different) monoids, we say that X is an *(S,T)-bisystem* if it is a left S-system, a right T-system, and if

$$ (sx)t = s(xt) \text{ for all } s \in S, t \in T \text{ and } x \in X. $$

If X and Y are both left S-systems, then an *S-morphism* or *S-map* is a map $\phi : X \to Y$ such that

$$ \phi(sx) = s\phi(x) \text{ for all } s \in S \text{ and } x \in X. $$

Morphisms of right S-systems and of (S, T)-bisystems are defined in an analogue way. If we are given a left T-system X and a right S-system Y, then we can give the cartesian product $X \times Y$ the structure of an (T, S)-bisystem by setting

$$ t(x, y) = (tx, y) \text{ and } (x, y)s = (x, ys). $$

Let now A be an (T, U)-bisystem, B an (U, S)-bisystem and C an (T, S)-bisystem. As explained above, we can give to $A \times B$ the structure of an (T, S)-bisystem. With this in mind we say that a (T, S)-map $\beta : A \times B \to C$ is a *bimap* if

$$ \beta(au, b) = \beta(a, ub) \text{ for all } a \in A, b \in B \text{ and } u \in U. $$

A pair $(A \otimes_U B, \psi)$ consisting of a (T, S)-bisystem $A \otimes_U B$ and a bimap $\psi : A \times B \to A \otimes_U B$ will be called a *tensor product of A and B over U* if for every (T, S)-bisystem C and every

bimap $\beta : A \times B \to C$, there exists a unique (T, S)-map $\bar{\beta} : A \otimes_U B \to C$ such that the diagram



commutes. It is proved in [23] that $A \otimes_U B$ exists and is unique up to isomorphism. The existence theorem reveals that $A \otimes_U B = (A \times B)/\tau$ where τ is the equivalence on $A \times B$ generated by the relation

$$T = \{((au, b), (a, ub)) : a \in A, b \in B, u \in U\}.$$

The equivalence class of a pair (a, b) is usually denoted by $a \otimes_U b$. To us is of interest the situation when $A = S = B$ where S is a monoid and U is a submonoid of S. Here A is clearly regarded as an (S, U)-bisystem with U acting on the right on A by multiplication, and B as an (U, S)-bisystem where U acts on the left on B by multiplication.

Another concept that is important to our approach is that of the dominion which is defined in [27] from Isbell. By definition, if U is a submonoid of a monoid S, then the dominion $\mathrm{Dom}_S(U)$ consists of all the elements $d \in S$ having the property that for every monoid T and every pair of monoid homomorphisms $f, g : S \to T$ that coincide in U, it follows that $f(d) = g(d)$. Related to dominions there is the well known zigzag theorem of Isbell. We will present here the Stenstrom version of it (theorem 8.3.3 of [23]) which reads. *Let U be a submonoid of a monoid S and let $d \in S$. Then, $d \in Dom_S(U)$ if and only if $d \otimes_U 1 = 1 \otimes_U d$ in the tensor product $A = S \otimes_U S$.* We mention here that this result holds true if S turns out to be a group and U a subgroup, both regarded as monoids. A key result (theorem 8.3.6 of [23]) that is used in the next section is the fact that any inverse semigroup U is absolutely closed in the sense that for every semigroup S containing U as a subsemigroup, $\mathrm{Dom}_S(U) = U$. It is obvious that groups are absolutely closed as special cases of inverse monoids (see [24]).

4 Peiffer operations and monoid actions

Before we explain how monoid actions are used to deal with the Peiffer operations on Y-sequences, we will introduce several monoids.

The first one is the monoid Υ defined by the monoid presentation $\mathcal{MP}(Y \cup Y^{-1}, P)$ where Y^{-1} is the set of group inverses of the elements of Y and P consists of all pairs $(ab, {}^{\theta(a)}ba)$ where $a, b \in Y \cup Y^{-1}$.

The second one is the group $\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon)$ given by the group presentation $(Y \cup Y^{-1}, \hat{P})$ where $\hat{P}$ is the set of all words $ab\iota(a)\iota({}^{\theta(a)}b)$ where by $\iota(c)$ we denote the inverse of c in the free group over $Y \cup Y^{-1}$. Before we introduce the next two monoids and the respective monoid actions, we stop to explain that Υ and $\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon)$ are special cases of a more general situation. If a monoid S is given by the monoid presentation $\mathcal{MP}(X, R)$, then its *universal enveloping*

group $\mathcal{G}(S)$ (see [1] and [8]) is defined to be the group given by the group presentation $(X, \hat{R})$ where $\hat{R}$ consists of all words $u\iota(v)$ whenever $(u, v) \in R$ where $\iota(v)$ is the inverse of v in the free group over X. We let for future use $\sigma : FM(X) \to S$ the respective canonical homomorphism where $FM(X)$ is the free monoid on X. It is easy to see that there is a monoid homomorphism $\mu_S : S \to \mathcal{G}(S)$ which satisfies the following universal property. For every group G and monoid homomorphism $f : S \to G$, there is a unique group homomorphism $\hat{f} : \mathcal{G}(S) \to G$ such that $\hat{f}\mu_S = f$. This universal property is an indication of an adjoint situation. Specifically, the functor $\mathcal{G} : \mathbf{Mon} \to \mathbf{Grp}$ which maps every monoid to its universal group, is a left adjoint to the forgetful functor $U : \mathbf{Grp} \to \mathbf{Mon}$. This ensures that $\mathcal{G}(S)$ is an invariant of the presentation of S.

The third monoid we consider is the submonoid $\mathfrak{U}$ of Υ, having the same unit as Υ, and is generated from all the elements of the form $\sigma(a)\sigma(a^{-1})$ with $a \in Y \cup Y^{-1}$. This monoid, acts on the left and on the right on Υ by the multiplication in Υ.

The last monoid considered is the subgroup $\hat{\mathfrak{U}}$ of $\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon)$ generated by $\mu(\mathfrak{U})$. Similarly to above, $\hat{\mathfrak{U}}$ acts on $\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon)$ by multiplication.

Given $\alpha = (a_1, ..., a_n)$ an Y-sequence over the group presentation $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$, then performing an elementary Peiffer operation on α can be interpreted in a simple way in terms of the monoids Υ and $\mathfrak{U}$. In what follows we will denote by $\sigma(\alpha)$ the element $\sigma(a_1)\cdots\sigma(a_n) \in \Upsilon$. If $\beta = (b_1, ..., b_n)$ is obtained from $\alpha = (a_1, ..., a_n)$ by performing an elementary Peiffer exchange, then from the definition of Υ, $\sigma(\alpha) = \sigma(\beta)$, therefore an elementary Peiffer exchange or a finite sequence of such has no effect on the element $\sigma(a_1) \cdots \sigma(a_n) \in \Upsilon$. Before we see the effect that a Peiffer insertion in α has on $\sigma(\alpha)$ we need the first claim of the following.

Lemma 4.1. *The elements of* $\mathfrak{U}$ *are central in* Υ *and those of* $\hat{\mathfrak{U}}$ *are central in* $\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon)$.

Proof. We see that for every a and $b \in Y \cup Y^{-1}$, $\sigma(a)\sigma(a^{-1})\sigma(b) = \sigma(b)\sigma(a)\sigma(a^{-1})$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(a)\sigma(a^{-1})\sigma(b) &= {}^{\theta(a)\theta(a^{-1})}\sigma(b)(\sigma(a)\sigma(a^{-1})) \\ &= \sigma(b)\sigma(a)\sigma(a^{-1}).\end{aligned}$$

Since elements $\sigma(b)$ and $\sigma(a)\sigma(a^{-1})$ are generators of Υ and $\mathfrak{U}$ respectively, then the first claim holds true. The second claim follows easily. □

If we insert (a, a^{-1}) at some point in $\alpha = (a_1, ..., a_n)$ to obtain $\alpha' = (a_1, ..., a, a^{-1}, ..., a_n)$, then from lemma 4.1,

$$\sigma(\alpha') = \sigma(\alpha) \cdot (\sigma(a)\sigma(a^{-1})),$$

which means that inserting (a, a^{-1}) inside a Y-sequence α has the same effect as multiplying the corresponding $\sigma(\alpha)$ in Υ by the element $\sigma(a)\sigma(a^{-1})$ of $\mathfrak{U}$. For the converse, it is obvious that any word $\beta \in FM(Y \cup Y^{-1})$ representing $\sigma(\alpha) \cdot (\sigma(a)\sigma(a^{-1}))$ is Peiffer equivalent to α. Of course the deletion has the obvious interpretation in our semigroup theoretic terms as the inverse of the above process. We retain the same names for our semigroup operations, that is insertion for multiplication by $\sigma(a)\sigma(a^{-1})$ and deletion for its inverse. Related to these operations on the elements of Υ we make the following definition.

Definition 4.2. *We denote by $\sim_{\mathfrak{U}}$ the equivalence relation in Υ generated by all pairs $(\sigma(\alpha), \sigma(\alpha)\cdot\sigma(a)\sigma(a^{-1}))$ where $\alpha \in FM(Y \cup Y^{-1})$ and $a \in Y \cup Y^{-1}$. We say that two elements $\sigma(a_1)\cdots\sigma(a_n)$ and $\sigma(b_1)\cdots\sigma(b_m)$ where $m, n \geq 0$ are Peiffer equivalent in Υ if they fall in the same $\sim_{\mathfrak{U}}$-class.*

From what we said before it is obvious that two Y-sequences α and β are Peiffer equivalent in the usual sense if and only if $\sigma(\alpha) \sim_{\mathfrak{U}} \sigma(\beta)$. For this reason we decided to make the following convention. If $\alpha = (a_1, ..., a_n)$ is a Y-sequence (resp. an identity Y-sequence), then its image in Υ, $\sigma(\alpha)$ will again be called a Y-sequence (resp. an identity Y-sequence). In the future instead of working directly with an Y-sequence α, we will work with its image $\sigma(\alpha)$.

We note that it should be mentioned that the study of $\sim_{\mathfrak{U}}$ might be as hard as the study of Peiffer operations on Y-sequences, and at this point it seems we have not made any progress at all. In fact this definition will become useful later in this section and yet we have to prove a few more things before we utilize it.

The process of inserting and deleting generators of $\mathfrak{U}$ in an element of Υ is related to the following new concept. Given U a submonoid of a monoid S and $d \in S$, then we say that d belongs to the *weak dominion of* U, shortly written as $d \in \mathrm{WDom}_S(U)$, if for every group G and every monoid homomorphisms $f, g : S \to G$ such that $f(u) = g(u)$ for every $u \in U$, then $f(d) = g(d)$. An analogue of the Stenström version of Isbell's theorem for weak dominion holds true. The proof of the if part of its analogue is similar to that of Isbell theorem apart from some minor differences that reflect the fact that we are working with *WDom* rather than *Dom* and that will become clear along the proof, while the converse relies on the universal property of $\mu : S \to \mathcal{G}(S)$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let S be a monoid, U a submonoid and let $\hat{U}$ be the subgroup of $\mathcal{G}(S)$ generated by elements $\mu(u)$ with $u \in U$. Then $d \in WDom_S(U)$ if and only if $\mu(d) \in \hat{U}$.*

Proof. The set $\hat{A} = \mathcal{G}(S) \otimes_{\hat{U}} \mathcal{G}(S)$ has an obvious $(\mathcal{G}(S), \mathcal{G}(S))$-bisystem structure. The free abelian group $\mathbb{Z}\hat{A}$ on $\hat{A}$ inherits a $(\mathcal{G}(S), \mathcal{G}(S))$-bisystem structure if we define

$$g \cdot \sum z_i(g_i \otimes_{\hat{U}} h_i) = \sum z_i(gg_i \otimes_{\hat{U}} h_i) \text{ and } \left(\sum z_i(g_i \otimes_{\hat{U}} h_i)\right) \cdot g = \sum z_i(g_i \otimes_{\hat{U}} h_i g).$$

The set $\mathcal{G}(S) \times \mathbb{Z}\hat{A}$ becomes a group by defining

$$(g, \sum z_i g_i \otimes_{\hat{U}} h_i) \cdot (g', \sum z'_i g'_i \otimes_{\hat{U}} h'_i) = (gg', \sum z_i g_i \otimes_{\hat{U}} h_i g' + \sum z'_i g g'_i \otimes_{\hat{U}} h'_i).$$

The associativity is proved easily. The unit element is $(1, 0)$ and for every $(g, \sum z_i g_i \otimes_{\hat{U}} h_i)$ its inverse is the element $(g^{-1}, -\sum z_i g^{-1} g_i \otimes_{\hat{U}} h_i g^{-1})$. Let us now define

$$\beta : S \to \mathcal{G}(S) \times \mathbb{Z}\hat{A} \text{ by } s \mapsto (\mu(s), 0),$$

which is clearly a monoid homomorphism, and

$$\gamma : S \to \mathcal{G}(S) \times \mathbb{Z}\hat{A} \text{ by } s \mapsto (\mu(s), \mu(s) \otimes_{\hat{U}} 1 - 1 \otimes_{\hat{U}} \mu(s)),$$

which is again seen to be a monoid homomorphism. These two coincide on U since for every $u \in U$

$$\gamma(u) = (\mu(u), \mu(u) \otimes_{\hat{U}} 1 - 1 \otimes_{\hat{U}} \mu(u)) = (\mu(u), 0) = \beta(u).$$

The last equality and the assumption that $d \in \mathrm{WDom}_S(U)$ imply that $\beta(d) = \gamma(d)$, therefore

$$(\mu(d), 0) = (\mu(d), \mu(d) \otimes_{\hat{U}} 1 - 1 \otimes_{\hat{U}} \mu(d)),$$

which shows that $\mu(d) \otimes_{\hat{U}} 1 = 1 \otimes_{\hat{U}} \mu(d)$ in the tensor product $\mathcal{G}(S) \otimes_{\hat{U}} \mathcal{G}(S)$ and therefore theorem 8.3.3, [23], applied for monoids $\mathcal{G}(S)$ and $\hat{U}$, implies that $\mu(d) \in \mathrm{Dom}_{\mathcal{G}(S)}(\hat{U})$. But $\mathrm{Dom}_{\mathcal{G}(S)}(\hat{U}) = \hat{U}$ as from theorem 8.3.6, [23] every inverse semigroup is absolutely closed, whence $\mu(d) \in \hat{U}$.

Conversely, suppose that $\mu(d) \in \hat{U}$ and we want to show that $d \in \mathrm{WDom}_S(U)$. Let G be a group and $f, g : S \to G$ two monoid homomorphisms that coincide in U, therefore the group homomorphisms $\hat{f}, \hat{g} : \mathcal{G}(S) \to G$ of the universal property of μ coincide in $\hat{U}$ which, from our assumption, implies that $\hat{f}(\mu(d)) = \hat{g}(\mu(d))$, and then $f(d) = g(d)$ proving that $d \in \mathrm{WDom}_S(U)$. □

Given a presentation $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$ for a group G, we consider the following free crossed module. If $\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon)$ is the universal group associated with $\mathcal{P}$ and F is the free group on $\mathbf{x}$, then we define

$$\tilde{\theta} : \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon) \to F \text{ by } \mu\sigma({}^{u}r)^{\varepsilon} \mapsto ur^{\varepsilon}u^{-1}.$$

It is easy to see that the triple $(\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon), F, \tilde{\theta})$ is the free crossed module over F on the set $\{r^{\varepsilon} : r \in \mathbf{r} \text{ and } \varepsilon = \pm 1\}$. The elements of $\mathrm{Ker}(\tilde{\theta})$ are central, therefore $\mathrm{Ker}(\tilde{\theta})$ is an abelian subgroup of $\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon)$ on which G acts on the left by the rule

$${}^{g}(\mu\sigma(a_1, ..., a_n)\iota\mu\sigma(b_1, ..., b_m)) = \mu\sigma({}^{w}a_1, ..., {}^{w}a_n)\iota\mu\sigma({}^{w}b_1, ..., {}^{w}b_m),$$

where w is a word in $FG(\mathbf{x})$ representing g. With this action $\mathrm{Ker}(\tilde{\theta})$ becomes a left G-module which we call *the generalized module of identities for* $\mathcal{P}$ and is denoted by $\tilde{\Pi}$. Also we note that $\hat{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a sub G-module of $\tilde{\Pi}$. In terms of these G-modules we prove the following analogue of theorem 3.1 of [32].

Theorem 4.4. *The following assertions are equivalent.*

(i) The presentation $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$ is aspherical.

(ii) For every identity Y-sequence d, $d \in WDom_{\Upsilon}(\mathfrak{U})$.

(iii) $\tilde{\Pi} = \hat{\mathfrak{U}}$.

Proof. $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$ Let $d = \sigma(a_1) \cdots \sigma(a_n) \in \Upsilon$ be any identity Y-sequence and as such it has to be Peiffer equivalent to 1. We proceed by showing that $d \in \mathrm{WDom}_{\Upsilon}(\mathfrak{U})$. Let G be any group and $f, g : \Upsilon \to G$ two monoid homomorphisms that coincide in $\mathfrak{U}$ and we want to show that $f(d) = g(d)$. The proof will be done by induction on the minimal number $h(d)$ of insertions and deletions needed to transform $d = \sigma(a_1) \cdots \sigma(a_n)$ to 1. If $h(d) = 1$,

then $d \in \mathfrak{U}$ and $f(d) = g(d)$. Suppose that $h(d) = n > 1$ and let τ be the first operation performed on d in a series of operations of minimal length. After τ is performed on d, it is obtained an element d' with $h(d') = n - 1$. By induction hypothesis, $f(d') = g(d')$ and we want to prove that $f(d) = g(d)$. There are two possible cases for τ. First, τ is an insertion and let $u = \sigma(a)\sigma(a^{-1}) \in \mathfrak{U}$ be the element inserted. It follows that $f(d') = f(d)f(u)$ and $g(d') = g(d)g(u)$, but $f(u) = g(u)$, therefore from cancellation law in the group G we get $f(d) = g(d)$. Second, τ is a deletion and let $u = \sigma(a)\sigma(a^{-1}) \in \mathfrak{U}$ be the element deleted, that is $d = d'u$. It follows immediately from the assumptions that $f(d) = g(d)$ proving that $d \in \mathrm{WDom}_{\Upsilon}(\mathfrak{U})$.

$(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)$ Let $\tilde{d} \in \tilde{\Pi}$. We may assume without loss of generality that no $\iota(\mu\sigma({}^{u}r)^{\varepsilon})$ is represented in $\tilde{d}$ for if there is any such occurrence, we can multiply $\tilde{d}$ by $\mu\sigma(({}^{u}r)^{\varepsilon}({}^{u}r)^{-\varepsilon})$ to obtain in return $\tilde{d}'$ where $\iota(\mu\sigma({}^{u}r)^{\varepsilon})$ is now replaced by $\mu\sigma(({}^{u}r)^{-\varepsilon})$. It is obvious that if $\tilde{d}' \in \hat{\mathfrak{U}}$, then $\tilde{d} \in \hat{\mathfrak{U}}$ and conversely. Let now d be any preimage of $\tilde{d}$ under μ. It is clear that d is an identity Y-sequence and as such $d \in \mathrm{WDom}_{\Upsilon}(\mathfrak{U})$. Then proposition 4.3 implies that $\tilde{d} = \mu(d) \in \hat{\mathfrak{U}}$.

$(iii) \Rightarrow (i)$ Assume that $\tilde{\Pi} = \hat{\mathfrak{U}}$ and we want to show that any identity Y-sequence d is Peiffer equivalent to 1. From the assumption for d we have that $\mu(d) \in \hat{\mathfrak{U}}$ and then proposition 4.3 implies that $d \in \mathrm{WDom}_{\Upsilon}(\mathfrak{U})$. Consider the group H/P as a quotient of $\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon)$ obtained by identifying $\iota(\mu\sigma({}^{u}r))$ with $\mu\sigma(({}^{u}r)^{-1})$ and let $\nu : \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon) \to H/P$ be the respective quotient morphism. Writing τ for the zero morphism from Υ to H/P, we see that τ and the composition $\nu\mu$ coincide in $\mathfrak{U}$, therefore since $d \in \mathrm{WDom}_{\Upsilon}(\mathfrak{U})$, it follows that $\nu\mu(d) = 1$ in H/P. The asphericity of $\mathcal{P}$ now follows from theorem 2.7, p.71 of [14]. □

5 A characterization for the asphericity of subpresentations

Let $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$ be an aspherical group presentation and $\mathcal{P}_1 = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}_1)$ a subpresentation of the first where $\mathbf{r}_1 = \mathbf{r} \setminus \{r_0\}$ and $r_0 \in \mathbf{r}$ is a fixed relation. We denote by Υ_1, $\mathfrak{U}_1$ monoids associated with $\mathcal{P}_1$ and by $\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon_1)$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{U}}_1$ their respective groups and let $\tilde{\theta}_1$ be the morphism of the free crossed module $\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon_1)$ whose kernel is denoted by $\tilde{\Pi}_1$. Also we consider $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1$ the subgroup of $\hat{\mathfrak{U}}$ generated by all $\mu\sigma(bb^{-1})$ where $b \in Y_1 \cup Y_1^{-1}$. Finally note that the monomorphism $f : \Upsilon_1 \to \Upsilon$ induced by the map $\sigma_1(a) \to \sigma(a)$ induces a homomorphism $\hat{f} : \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon_1) \to \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon)$. These data fit into a commutative diagram as depicted below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon_1) & \xrightarrow{\hat{f}} & \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon) \\ & {\scriptstyle\tilde{\theta}_1}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle\tilde{\theta}} & \\ & F & \end{array}$$

Before we prove our next result we define the relation module $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P})$. Given $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$ a presentation for a group G, we let $\alpha : FG(\mathbf{x}) \to G$ and $\beta : N \to N/[N, N]$ be the canonical homomorphisms where N is the normal closure of $\mathbf{r}$ in $FG(\mathbf{x})$ and $[N, N]$ its commutator

subgroup. There is a well defined G-action on $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}) = N/[N,N]$ given by

$$w^\alpha \cdot s^\beta = (w^{-1}sw)^\beta$$

for every $w \in FG(\mathbf{x})$ and $s \in N$. This action extends to an action of $\mathbb{Z}G$ over $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P})$ by setting

$$(w_1^\alpha \pm w_2^\alpha) \cdot s^\beta = (w_1^{-1}sw_1w_2^{-1}s^{\pm 1}w_2)^\beta.$$

When $\mathcal{P}$ is aspherical, the bases of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P})$ as a free $\mathbb{Z}G$ module is the set of elements r^β with $r \in \mathbf{r}$.

Lemma 5.1. *If $\mathcal{P}$ is aspherical, then the subgroup $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1$ is a free abelian with bases equipotent to the set $G \times \mathbf{r}_1$.*

Proof. The result follows if we show that $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1 \cong \mathcal{N}_1(\mathcal{P})$ as groups where $\mathcal{N}_1(\mathcal{P})$ is the subgroup of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P})$ generated by all the elements of the form $u^\alpha \cdot r^\beta$ where $r \in \mathbf{r}_1$. For this we define

$$\Omega : \mathcal{N}_1(\mathcal{P}) \to \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1$$

on free generators by $u^\alpha \cdot r^\beta \mapsto \mu\sigma({}^u r({}^u r)^{-1})$ which is clearly well defined. Let

$$\xi = \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i^\alpha \cdot r_i^\beta - \sum_{j=n+1}^{m} v_j^\alpha \cdot r_j^\beta \in \mathrm{Ker}(\Omega),$$

which means that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} \mu\sigma({}^{u_i} r_i({}^{u_i} r_i)^{-1})\iota \left(\prod_{j=n+1}^{m} \mu\sigma({}^{v_j} r_j({}^{v_j} r_j)^{-1}) \right) = 1. \tag{4}$$

To prove that $\xi = 0$ we will proceed as follows. Define

$$\gamma : FM(Y \cup Y^{-1}) \to \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P})$$

on free generators as follows

$$({}^u r)^\varepsilon \mapsto u^\alpha \cdot r^\beta.$$

It is easy to see that γ is compatible with the defining relations of Υ, hence there is $g : \Upsilon \to \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P})$ and then the universal property of μ implies the existence of $\hat{g} : \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon) \to \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P})$ such that $\hat{g}\mu = g$. If we apply now $\hat{g}$ on both sides of (4) obtain

$$2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i^\alpha \cdot r_i^\beta - 2 \cdot \sum_{j=n+1}^{m} v_j^\alpha \cdot r_j^\beta = 0,$$

proving that $\xi = 0$. □

Further we note that the normal closure N_0 of r_0 in $FG(\mathbf{x})$ acts on the left of $\tilde{\Pi}_1$ in the obvious way therefore we have the displacement subgroup $[\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0]$ of $\tilde{\Pi}_1$ (see [6]).

Proposition 5.2. *If $\mathcal{P}$ is aspherical, then there is an epimorphism from $\tilde{\Pi}_1/[\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0]$ to $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1$.*

Proof. First we show that $\hat{f}$ maps $\tilde{\Pi}_1$ onto $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1$. Let $\tilde{d} = \mu_1\sigma_1(a_1 \cdots a_n) \in \tilde{\Pi}_1$ where as before no a_i is equal to any $\iota(\mu_1\sigma_1({}^u r)^\varepsilon)$ and assume that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{f}(\tilde{d}) =&(\mu\sigma(b_1b_1^{-1}) \cdots \mu\sigma(b_sb_s^{-1})) \cdot (\iota(\mu\sigma(b_{s+1}b_{s+1}^{-1})) \cdots \iota(\mu\sigma(b_rb_r^{-1})))\\ &(\mu\sigma(c_1c_1^{-1}) \cdots \mu\sigma(c_tc_t^{-1})) \cdot (\iota(\mu\sigma(d_1d_1^{-1})) \cdots \iota(\mu\sigma(d_kd_k^{-1}))),\end{aligned}$$

where the first half involves elements from $Y_1 \cup Y_1^{-1}$ and the second one is

$$\mu\sigma(C)\iota(\mu\sigma(D))$$

with

$$C = c_1c_1^{-1} \cdots c_tc_t^{-1} \text{ and } D = d_1d_1^{-1} \cdots d_kd_k^{-1},$$

where C and D involve only elements of the form $({}^u r_0)^\varepsilon$ with $\varepsilon = \pm 1$. Recalling from above that in $\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mu\sigma((a_1 \cdots a_n) \cdot ((b_{s+1}b_{s+1}^{-1}) \cdots (b_rb_r^{-1})) \cdot ((d_1d_1^{-1}) \cdots (d_kd_k^{-1})))\\ &\quad = \mu\sigma(((b_1b_1^{-1}) \cdots (b_sb_s^{-1})) \cdot ((c_1c_1^{-1}) \cdots (c_tc_t^{-1}))),\end{aligned}$$

we can apply $\hat{g}$ defined in lemma 5.1 on both sides and get

$$\begin{aligned}&g\sigma((a_1 \cdots a_n) \cdot ((b_{s+1}b_{s+1}^{-1}) \cdots (b_rb_r^{-1})) \cdot ((d_1d_1^{-1}) \cdots (d_kd_k^{-1})))\\ &\quad = g\sigma(((b_1b_1^{-1}) \cdots (b_sb_s^{-1})) \cdot ((c_1c_1^{-1}) \cdots (c_tc_t^{-1}))).\end{aligned}$$

If we now write each $c_i = ({}^{u_i} r_0)^{\varepsilon_i}$ and each $d_j = ({}^{v_j} r_0)^{\delta_j}$ where ε_i and $\delta_j = \pm 1$, while we write each $a_\ell = ({}^{w_\ell} r_\ell)^{\gamma_\ell}$ and each $b_p = ({}^{\eta_p}\rho_p)^{\epsilon_p}$ where all r_ℓ and ρ_p belong to $\mathbf{r}_1$ and $\gamma_\ell, \epsilon_p = \pm 1$, then the definition of g yields

$$\begin{aligned}&(w_1^\alpha \cdot r_1^\beta + \cdots + w_n^\alpha \cdot r_n^\beta) + (2\eta_{s+1}^\alpha \cdot \rho_{s+1}^\beta + \cdots + 2\eta_r^\alpha \cdot \rho_r^\beta) + (2v_1^\alpha + \cdots + 2v_k^\alpha) \cdot r_0^\beta\\ &\quad = (2\eta_1^\alpha \cdot \rho_1^\beta + \cdots + 2\eta_s^\alpha \cdot \rho_s^\beta) + (2u_1^\alpha + \cdots + 2u_t^\alpha) \cdot r_0^\beta\end{aligned}$$

The freeness of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P})$ on the set of elements r^β implies in particular that

$$(2v_1^\alpha + \cdots + 2v_k^\alpha) \cdot r_0^\beta = (2u_1^\alpha + \cdots + 2u_t^\alpha) \cdot r_0^\beta$$

from which we see that $k = t$, and after a rearrangement of terms $u_i^\alpha = v_i^\alpha$ for $i = 1, ..., k$. The easily verified fact that in $\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon)$, $\mu\sigma(aa^{-1}) = \mu\sigma(a^{-1}a)$ and the fact that if $u^\alpha = v^\alpha$, then for every $s \in \mathbf{r}$, $\mu\sigma(({}^v s)^\delta({}^v s)^{-\delta}) = \mu\sigma(({}^u s)^\delta({}^u s)^{-\delta})$, one can deduce easily that

$$\mu\sigma(({}^v r_0)^\delta({}^v r_0)^{-\delta}) = \mu\sigma(({}^u r_0)^\varepsilon({}^u r_0)^{-\varepsilon}).$$

If we apply the latter to pairs (c_i, d_i) for which $u_i^\alpha = v_i^\alpha$, we get that $\mu\sigma(C)\iota(\mu\sigma(D)) = 1$ which shows that $\hat{f}(\tilde{d}) \in \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1$.

Second, $\hat{f}$ induces $\hat{\varphi} : \tilde{\Pi}_1/[\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0] \to \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1$ because if $\iota(\tilde{d})^{n_0}\tilde{d}$ is any generator of $[\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0]$ and if $\hat{f}(\tilde{d}) = \hat{u}\iota(\hat{v})$ where $\hat{u}, \hat{v} \in \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1$, then

$$\hat{f}(\iota(\tilde{d})^{n_0}\tilde{d}) = \hat{v}\iota(\hat{u}) \cdot^{n_0} \hat{u}^{n_0}\iota(\hat{v}) = 1,$$

since for every $\hat{u} \in \hat{\mathfrak{U}}$, ${}^{n_0}\hat{u} = \hat{u}$ in $\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon)$. □

The following reduces the search for the asphericity of the subpresentation $\mathcal{P}_1$ in certain identity sequences and in proving that the groups $\tilde{\Pi}_1/[\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0]$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1$ are isomorphic. The identity sequences we narrow the problem to have the form ${}^{n_0}dd^{-1}$ where $d = ({}^{u_1}r_1)^{\varepsilon_1}, ..., ({}^{u_n}r_n)^{\varepsilon_n})$ is an identity Y_1-sequence and $d^{-1} = (({}^{u_n}r_n)^{-\varepsilon_n}, ..., ({}^{u_1}r_1)^{-\varepsilon_1})$.

Theorem 5.3. *The subpresentation $\mathcal{P}_1 = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}_1)$ is aspherical if and only if for every identity Y_1-sequence d and every $n_0 \in N_0$, ${}^{n_0}dd^{-1} \sim_{\mathfrak{U}_1} 1$ and that the groups $\tilde{\Pi}_1/[\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0]$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1$ are isomorphic under $\hat{\varphi}$.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{P}_1$ is aspherical, then the first claim follows directly since ${}^{n_0}dd^{-1}$ is an identity Y_1-sequence. To prove the second claim, we show that $\hat{\varphi}$ has an inverse. Indeed, since from lemma 5.1, $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1$ is free abelian with bases the set of elements of the form $\mu\sigma({}^ur({}^ur)^{-1})$ we can define

$$\hat{\varphi}' : \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1 \to \tilde{\Pi}_1/[\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0] \text{ by } \mu\sigma({}^ur({}^ur)^{-1}) \mapsto \mu_1\sigma_1({}^ur({}^ur)^{-1})[\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0],$$

which is well defined and a right inverse of $\hat{\varphi}$ since from the definition, $\hat{\varphi}\hat{\varphi}' = id_{\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1}$. To prove that $\hat{\varphi}'$ is a left inverse of $\hat{\varphi}$ we recall from theorem 4.4 that $\tilde{\Pi}_1 \cong \hat{\mathfrak{U}}_1$ hence for every generator $\mu_1\sigma_1({}^ur({}^rr)^{-1}) \cdot [\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0]$ of $\tilde{\Pi}_1/[\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0]$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\varphi}'\hat{\varphi}(\mu_1\sigma_1({}^ur({}^rr)^{-1}) \cdot [\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0]) &= \hat{\varphi}'\hat{f}(\mu_1\sigma_1({}^ur({}^rr)^{-1})) \\ &= \hat{\varphi}'\mu\sigma({}^ur({}^rr)^{-1}) \\ &= \mu_1\sigma_1({}^ur({}^ur)^{-1})[\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0],\end{aligned}$$

proving that $\hat{\varphi}'\hat{\varphi} = id_{\tilde{\Pi}_1/[\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0]}$.

Conversely, let d be any identity Y_1-sequence and $u, v \in \mathfrak{U}_1$ such that

$$\hat{\varphi}(\mu_1(u)\iota\mu_1(v)) \cdot [\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0]) = \hat{\varphi}(\mu_1\sigma_1(d) \cdot [\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0]).$$

Such elements exist because $\hat{f}(\mu_1\sigma_1(d)) \in \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1$. But $\hat{\varphi}$ is an isomorphism, hence there is $K \in [\tilde{\Pi}_1, N_0]$ such that

$$\mu_1\sigma_1(d) = \mu_1(u)\iota\mu_1(v) \cdot K, \tag{5}$$

where K equals to a product of generators ${}^{n_{0,i}}\tilde{d}_i\iota(\tilde{d}_i)$ since conjugating a generator by an element of $\tilde{\Pi}_1$ does not alter the generator. If in any of $\tilde{d}_i$ that is represented in K there is a factor of the form $\iota(\mu_1\sigma_1(({}^ur)^{\varepsilon}))$, we multiply both sides of (5) by $\mu_1\sigma_1(({}^ur)^{\varepsilon}({}^ur)^{-\varepsilon})$ with the effect that in that $\tilde{d}_i$ the factor $\iota(\mu_1\sigma_1(({}^ur)^{\varepsilon}))$ is replaced by $\mu_1\sigma_1(({}^ur)^{-\varepsilon})$. Doing this as many times as necessary, we get

$$\mu_1\sigma_1(d)\mu_1(w) = \mu_1(u)\iota\mu_1(v) \cdot K', \tag{6}$$

where $w \in \mathfrak{U}_1$ and K' is a product of elements of the form $\mu_1\sigma_1(({}^{n_0}\delta)^{\varepsilon}(\delta)^{-\varepsilon})$ where δ is an identity Y_1-sequence. If we apply on both sides of (6) the canonical map $\nu_1 : \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon_1) \to H_1/P_1$ where H_1/P_1 is the usual free crossed module for $\mathcal{P}_1$, then we see that dP_1 equals to a product of cosets of the form $({}^{n_0}\delta)^{\varepsilon}(\delta)^{-\varepsilon}P_1$ which from our assumption is trivial, thereby proving the claim. □

Corollary 5.4. *If $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$ and $\mathcal{P}_1 = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}_1)$ are as before with $\mathcal{P}$ being aspherical, and d_1 is any identity Y_1-sequence, then $f(d_1) \in WDom_{\Upsilon}(\mathfrak{U}_1)$.*

Proof. From the proof of proposition 5.2, $\hat{f}(\mu_1(d_1)) \in \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_1$. Proposition 4.3 implies that $f(d_1) \in \mathrm{WDom}_{\Upsilon}(\mathfrak{U}_1)$. □

A positive answer of the Whitehead asphericity question would follow if the above result was true for Υ_1 rather than for Υ. So we would be able to answer the question in affirmative if the implication: "*if d_1 is an identity Y_1-sequence such that $f(d_1) \in WDom_{\Upsilon}(\mathfrak{U}_1)$, then $d_1 \in WDom_{\Upsilon_1}(\mathfrak{U}_1)$*" is true whenever $\mathcal{P}$ is aspherical. Thus, the Whitehead problem is expressed in terms of the theory of semigroups.

6 Adding one generator and one relator

The special case we deal with in this section is that of the pair of presentations $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x} \cup z, \mathbf{r} \cup w(x,z))$ and $\mathcal{P}_1 = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$ where $\mathbf{r} \subset FG(\mathbf{x})$, $w(x,z) \in FG(\mathbf{x} \cup z)$ and $\mathcal{P}$ is aspherical. If we denote by N_0 the normal closure of $r_0 = w(x,z)$ in $F = FG(\mathbf{x} \cup z)$, we assume further that F decomposes as a semidirect product $N_0 \rtimes F_1$ where F_1 is the free group on $\mathbf{x}$ and the action of F_1 on N_0 is by conjugation.

To prove our next theorem we will need the free crossed module $(H_1/P_1, F_1, \theta_1)$ for $\mathcal{P}_1$, and the crossed module $(H_0/P_0, N_0, \theta_0)$ arising from the free crossed module for $\mathcal{P}_0 = (\mathbf{x} \cup z, w(x,z))$ by restricting its codomain to N_0. Note that this crossed module is not free in general.

Theorem 6.1. *Given $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x} \cup z, \mathbf{r} \cup w(x,z))$ an aspherical presentation where $\mathbf{r} \subset FG(\mathbf{x})$ and $w(x,z) \in FG(\mathbf{x} \cup z)$, and assume that $F \cong N_0 \rtimes F_1$, then the subpresentation $\mathcal{P}_1 = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})$ is also aspherical.*

The situation considered in theorem 6.1 generalizes situations that can be encountered in important cases like the one considered in the following example which is meant to illustrate the theorem.

Example 6.2. *A presentation $\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{x} \cup z, \mathbf{r} \cup w(x,z))$ with the requirement that $F = N_0 \rtimes F_1$ where the action of F_1 on N_0 is by conjugation can be any reducible LOT presentation (see [21] and [25]). Such a presentation has generators $x_1, ..., x_n$ and relators $r_1, ..., r_m$ where each r_s has the form $x_j x_k x_j^{-1} x_i^{-1}$ and there is a generator z that occurs exactly once among the set of relators. The normal closure N_0 in the free group $FG(\{x_1, ..., x_n\})$ of the corresponding relator satisfies the property assumed in the theorem. On the other hand, there are LOT presentations which are aspherical. Indeed, it is shown in [30] that the LOT with generators $x_1, ..., x_n$ and relators $U x_i U^{-1} x_{i+1}^{-1}$, where $i = 1, ..., n-1$ and U is any word from $FG(\{x_1, ..., x_n\})$ is always aspherical. If it happens that U is a word from $FG(\{x_2, ..., x_n\})$, then that LOT is in addition reducible where the generator that occurs exactly once among the set of relators is x_1. We remark though that the asphericity of the subpresentation obtained by removing x_1 and $U x_1 U^{-1} x_2^{-1}$ follows directly from the well known fact that the*

corresponding 2-complex of the smaller presentation is homotopy equivalent to the 2-complex of the bigger one. This reduction is typical with LOT presentations but it might turn out to be false in more complex cases, and we remark here that our method applies to any possible situation as assumed in the theorem.

Before we prove the theorem we show that there exists a semidirect product of crossed modules $(H_0/P_0, N_0, \theta_0) \rtimes (H_1/P_1, F_1, \theta_1)$. To achieve this we need to prove first a few auxiliary results. Since $\mathcal{P}_0$ is aspherical, then from theorem 3.1 of [32] θ_0 is an isomorphism and its inverse is the map

$$\partial : N_0 \to H_0/P_0 \text{ defined by } \prod_{i\in I} u_i r_0^{\varepsilon_i} u_i^{-1} \mapsto \prod_{i\in I} ({}^{u_i}r_0)^{\varepsilon_i} P_0.$$

The definition shows that ∂ is an F-map too.

For every $u \in FG(\mathbf{x})$, $r \in \mathbf{r}$ and $\varepsilon = \pm 1$ we define

$$\eta_{(u_r)^\varepsilon} : N_0 \to H_0/P_0 \text{ by } n_0 \mapsto {}^{ur^\varepsilon u^{-1}}(\partial(n_0))(\partial(n_0))^{-1}.$$

Lemma 6.3. *$\eta_{(u_r)^\varepsilon}$ is a regular derivation.*

Proof. Indeed, for every $n_0, m_0 \in N_0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_{(u_r)^\varepsilon}(n_0 m_0) &= {}^{ur^\varepsilon u^{-1}}(\partial(n_0 m_0))(\partial(n_0 m_0))^{-1} \\
&= ({}^{ur^\varepsilon u^{-1}}\partial(n_0))({}^{ur^\varepsilon u^{-1}}\partial(m_0))(\partial(m_0))^{-1}(\partial(n_0))^{-1} \\
&= \left({}^{ur^\varepsilon u^{-1}}\partial(n_0)(\partial(n_0))^{-1}\right)\ {}^{n_0}\left({}^{ur^\varepsilon u^{-1}}\partial(m_0)(\partial(m_0))^{-1}\right) \\
&= \left(\eta_{(u_r)^\varepsilon}(n_0)\right)\ {}^{n_0}\left(\eta_{(u_r)^\varepsilon}(m_0)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Also $\eta_{(u_r)^\varepsilon}$ is regular. Indeed, for every $n_0 \in N_0$ we see from (1) and (2) that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\eta_{(u_r)^\varepsilon} \circ \eta_{(u_r)^{-\varepsilon}})(n_0) =& \eta_{(u_r)^\varepsilon}\left(\theta_0(\eta_{(u_r)^{-\varepsilon}}(n_0))n_0\right)\eta_{(u_r)^{-\varepsilon}}(n_0) \\
=& \eta_{(u_r)^\varepsilon}(ur^{-\varepsilon}u^{-1}n_0 ur^\varepsilon u^{-1})({}^{ur^{-\varepsilon}u^{-1}}\partial(n_0)(\partial(n_0)^{-1}) \\
=& {}^{ur^\varepsilon u^{-1}}\partial(ur^{-\varepsilon}u^{-1}n_0 ur^\varepsilon u^{-1})(\partial(ur^{-\varepsilon}u^{-1}n_0 ur^\varepsilon u^{-1}))^{-1}({}^{ur^{-\varepsilon}u^{-1}}\partial(n_0)(\partial(n_0)^{-1}) \\
=& 1.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Now we define

$$\eta : H_1/P_1 \to \mathrm{D}(N_0, H_0/P_0)$$

on generators ${}^u r P_1$ by setting

$$\eta({}^u r P_1) = \eta_{u_r}.$$

Lemma 6.4. *η is well defined and therefore a homomorphism.*

Proof. To see it is well defined we need to check that for every $n_0 \in N_0$ and ${}^{u}r,\ {}^{v}s \in H_1$ we have that $(\eta_{u_r} \circ \eta_{v_s})(n_0) = (\eta_{uru^{-1}v_s} \circ \eta_{u_r})(n_0)$. Indeed, on the one hand we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\eta_{u_r} \circ \eta_{v_s})(n_0) &= \eta_{u_r}(\sigma_{\eta_{v_s}}(n_0)) \cdot (\eta_{v_s}(n_0)) && \text{(by (2))} \\
&= \eta_{u_r}\left(\theta_0\left({}^{vsv^{-1}}\partial(n_0)(\partial(n_0)^{-1}\right) \cdot n_0\right) \cdot \left({}^{vsv^{-1}}\partial(n_0)(\partial(n_0))^{-1}\right) && \text{(by (1))} \\
&= \eta_{u_r}\left(vsv^{-1}n_0vs^{-1}v^{-1}\right) \cdot \left({}^{vsv^{-1}}\partial(n_0)(\partial(n_0))^{-1}\right) \\
&= {}^{uru^{-1}\cdot vsv^{-1}}\partial(n_0)(\partial(n_0))^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

and on the other hand we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\eta_{uru^{-1}v_s} \circ \eta_{u_r})(n_0) &= \eta_{uru^{-1}v_s}\left(\sigma_{\eta_{u_r}}(n_0)\right) \cdot (\eta_{u_r}(n_0)) \\
&= \eta_{uru^{-1}v_s}\left(\theta_0\left({}^{uru^{-1}}\partial(n_0)(\partial(n_0))^{-1}\right) \cdot n_0\right) \cdot \left({}^{uru^{-1}}\partial(n_0)(\partial(n_0))^{-1}\right) \\
&= \eta_{uru^{-1}v_s}\left(uru^{-1}n_0ur^{-1}u\right) \cdot \left({}^{uru^{-1}}\partial(n_0)(\partial(n_0))^{-1}\right) \\
&= \left({}^{uru^{-1}\cdot vsv^{-1}\cdot ur^{-1}u^{-1}}\left({}^{uru^{-1}}\partial(n_0)\right)\left({}^{uru^{-1}}\partial(n_0)\right)^{-1}\right) \cdot \left({}^{uru^{-1}}\partial(n_0)(\partial(n_0))^{-1}\right) \\
&= {}^{uru^{-1}\cdot vsv^{-1}}\partial(n_0)(\partial(n_0))^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\eta({}^{u}r\ {}^{v}sP_1)(n_0) = \eta({}^{uru^{-1}v}s\ {}^{u}rP_1)(n_0)$. □

Further we define

$$\rho : F_1 \to \mathrm{Aut}(H_0/P_0, N_0) \text{ by } u \mapsto (\rho_1(u), \rho_2(u)),$$

where

$$\rho_1(u) : H_0/P_0 \to H_0/P_0 \text{ is defined on generators by } {}^{w}r_0P_0 \mapsto {}^{uw}r_0P_0,$$

and similarly

$$\rho_2(u) : N_0 \to N_0 \text{ by } n_0 \mapsto un_0u^{-1}.$$

It is easy to see that both $\rho_1(u)$ and $\rho_2(u)$ are automorphisms that make the following diagram commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H_0/P_0 & \xrightarrow{\theta_0} & N_0 \\
{\scriptstyle \rho_1(u)}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho_2(u)} \\
H_0/P_0 & \xrightarrow[\theta_0]{} & N_0
\end{array}$$

and that ρ is itself a homomorphism.

Lemma 6.5. *There exists the semidirect product* $(H_0/P_0, N_0, \theta_0) \rtimes_{\langle\eta,\rho\rangle} (H_1/P_1, F_1, \theta_1)$ *of crossed modules.*

Proof. It is sufficient to show that the homomorphisms η and ρ make the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_1/P_1 & \xrightarrow{\quad\theta_1\quad} & F_1 \\ {\scriptstyle\eta}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\rho} \\ \mathrm{D}(N_0, H_0/P_0) & \xrightarrow[\Delta]{} & \mathrm{Aut}(H_0/P_0, N_0, \theta_0) \end{array}$$

commutative. Indeed, on the one hand we have that

$$\Delta(\eta({}^{u}rP_1)) = (\tau_{\eta_{u_r}}, \sigma_{\eta_{u_r}}),$$

and on the other hand that

$$\rho\theta_1({}^{u}rP_1) = (\rho_1(uru^{-1}), \rho_2(uru^{-1})),$$

and see that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\eta_{u_r}}({}^{w}r_0P_0) &= \eta_{u_r}(wr_0w^{-1}) \cdot ({}^{w}r_0P_0) \\ &= {}^{uru^{-1}w}r_0P_0 \cdot ({}^{w}r_0P_0)^{-1} \cdot ({}^{w}r_0P_0) \\ &= {}^{uru^{-1}w}r_0P_0 \\ &= \rho_1(uru^{-1})({}^{w}r_0P_0), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly that

$$\sigma_{\eta_{u_r}}(wr_0w^{-1}) = \rho_2(uru^{-1})(wr_0w^{-1}),$$

showing that $\Delta\eta = \rho\theta_1$. □

The following shows that $(H_0/P_0 \rtimes H_1/P_1, N_0 \rtimes F_1, \pi)$ induces another crossed module with codomain F.

Lemma 6.6. *The triple $(H_0/P_0 \rtimes H_1/P_1, F, p\circ\pi)$ is a crossed module where $p : N_0 \rtimes F_1 \to F$ is the homomorphism of groups given by $(u_0, u_1) \mapsto u_0u_1$.*

Proof. Since $F = N_0 \rtimes F_1$, every element $u \in F$ decomposes uniquely as a product u_0u_1 where $u_0 \in N_0$ and $u_1 \in F_1$. Now we define the left action of F on $H_0/P_0 \rtimes H_1/P_1$ by setting for every $(a_0, a_1) \in H_0/P_0 \rtimes H_1/P_1$ and every $u \in F$ written uniquely as u_0u_1,

$${}^{u}(a_0, a_1) = {}^{(u_0,u_1)}(a_0, a_1). \tag{7}$$

Let's check the conditions for $(H_0/P_0 \rtimes H_1/P_1, F, p \circ \pi)$ to be a crossed module. First,

$$\begin{aligned} (a_0, a_1)(b_0, b_1) &= {}^{\pi((a_0,a_1))}(b_0, b_1)(a_0, a_1) \\ &= {}^{(\theta_0(a_0),\theta_1(a_1))}(b_0, b_1)(a_0, a_1) \\ &= {}^{\theta_0(a_0)\theta_1(a_1)}(b_0, b_1)(a_0, a_1) \\ &= {}^{(p\circ\pi)((a_0,a_1))}(b_0, b_1)(a_0, a_1). \end{aligned}$$

Second,

$$\begin{aligned}
(p\circ\pi)\,({}^{u}(a_0,a_1)) &= (p\circ\pi)\left({}^{(u_0,u_1)}(a_0,a_1)\right)\\
&= (p\circ\pi)\left({}^{u}a_0\,(\eta({}^{u_1}a_1)(u_0))^{-1},\ {}^{u_1}a_1\right) && \text{(by (3))}\\
&= u\theta_0(a_0)u^{-1}\cdot\theta_0\left(\partial(u_0)\left({}^{u_1\theta_1(a_1)u_1^{-1}}\partial(u_0)\right)^{-1}\right)\cdot u_1\theta_1(a_1)u_1^{-1}\\
&= u\theta_0(a_0)u^{-1}u_0u_1\theta_1(a_1)u_1^{-1}u_0^{-1}u_1\theta_1(a_1)^{-1}u_1^{-1}\cdot u_1\theta_1(a_1)u_1^{-1}\\
&= u(\theta_0(a_0)\theta_1(a_1))u^{-1} = u((p\circ\pi)(a_0,a_1))u^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Now we are ready to prove the theorem.

Proof. (**Proof of theorem 6.1**) We show that there is a morphism ψ from the free crossed module $(H/P, F, \theta)$ to the crossed module $(H_0/P_0 \rtimes H_1/P_1, F, p\circ\pi)$. For this we define a map

$$w : \{r_0\}\cup\mathbf{r}\to H_0/P_0\rtimes H_1/P_1$$

such that

$$w(s) = \begin{cases} (r_0P_0, P_1) & \text{if} \quad s = r_0\\ (P_0, rP_1) & \text{if} \quad s = r\in\mathbf{r}\end{cases}$$

Obviously, $\theta(sP) = ((p\circ\pi)\circ w)(s)$ for every $s\in\mathbf{r}\cup r_0$, therefore the freeness of H/P implies the existence of the desired ψ which maps rP to (P_0, rP_1) for $r\in\mathbf{r}$ and r_0P to (r_0P_0, P_1).

Finally we prove the asphericity of $\mathcal{P}_1$. Let $({}^{u_1}r_1)^{\varepsilon_1}, ..., ({}^{u_s}r_s)^{\varepsilon_s})$ be an identity sequence for $\mathcal{P}_1$. Since it can be also regarded as an identity sequence for $\mathcal{P}$, then $\prod_{i=1}^{s}({}^{u_i}r_i)^{\varepsilon_i}P = 1$ in H/P. Applying ψ on both sides we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(P_0,P_1) &= \prod_{i=1}^{s}\left({}^{(1,u_i)}(P_0, r_iP_1)\right)^{\varepsilon_i} && \text{(by (7))}\\
&= \prod_{i=1}^{s}(P_0, {}^{u_i}r_iP_1)^{\varepsilon_i} && \text{(by (3))}\\
&= \prod_{i=1}^{s}(P_0, ({}^{u_i}r_i)^{\varepsilon_i}P_1) = (P_0, \prod_{i=1}^{s}({}^{u_i}r_i)^{\varepsilon_i}P_1),
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\prod_{i=1}^{s}({}^{u_i}r_i)^{\varepsilon_i}P_1 = P_1$ proving the asphericity of $\mathcal{P}_1$. □

References

[1] Bergman, G.M., *An Invitation to General Algebra and Universal Constructions*, Henry Helson, (1998)

[2] Bestvina, M., Brady, N., *Morse theory and finiteness properties of groups*, Invent. Math., 129(3):445-470, 1997

[3] Bogley, W.A., Pride, S.J., *Aspherical relative presentations*, Proc. Edinburg Math. Soc. 35, 1-39, (1992)

[4] Brown, R., Huebschmann, J., *Identities among relations, in Low-dimensional Topology*, Proc. Bangor Symp., 1979, Ed. R. Brown and T. L. Thickstun, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Series, Cambridge University Press, (1981)

[5] Brown, R., *On The second relative homotopy group of an adjunction space: an exposition of a theorem of J. H. C. Whitehead*, J. London Math. Soc. (2), 22, 146-152, (1980)

[6] Brown, R., Higgins, P.J., Sivera, R., *Nonabelian Algebraic Topology, filtered spaces, crossed complexes, cubical homotopy groupoids*, EMS Tracts in Mathematics Vol. 15, (2011)

[7] Chiswell, I., M., Collins, D., J., Huebschmann, J., *Aspherical Group Presentations*, Math. Z., 178, 1-36, (1981)

[8] Cohn, P.M., *Universal Algebra*, New York : Harper and Row, (1965)

[9] Collins, D. J., Huebschmann, J., *Spherical diagrams and identities among relations*, Math. Ann., 261(2):155-183, 1982

[10] Eilenberg, S., Ganea, T., *On the Lusternik-Schnirelmann category of abstract groups*, Ann. of Math. (2), 65:517-518, 1957

[11] Gersten, S. M., *Branched coverings of 2-complexes and diagrammatic reducibility*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 303(2):689-706, 1987

[12] Gersten, S. M., *Reducible diagrams and equations over groups*, In Essays in group theory, volume 8 of Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., pages 15-73. Springer, New York, 1987.

[13] Gutierrez, M., Ratcliffe, J.G., *On the second homotopy group*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford (2) 32, 45-55, (1981)

[14] Hog-Angeloni, C., Metzler, W., and Sieradski, A. J. (eds.), *Two-dimensional homotopy and combinatorial group theory* London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. 197, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1993)

[15] Howie, J., *Aspherical and acyclic 2-complexes*, J. London Math. Soc. (2), 20(3):549-558, 1979

[16] Howie, J., *On pairs of 2-complexes and systems of equations over groups*, J. Reine Angew. Math., 324:165-174, 1981

[17] Howie, J., *On the fundamental group of an almost-acyclic 2-complex*, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. (2), 24(2):119-122, 1981

[18] Howie, J., *On locally indicable groups*, Math. Z., 180(4):445-461, 1982

[19] Howie, J., *Some remarks on a problem of J. H. C. Whitehead*, Topology, 22(4):475-485, 1983

[20] Howie, J., *Spherical diagrams and equations over groups*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc., 96(2):255-268, 1984

[21] Howie, J., *On the asphericity of ribbon disc complements*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 289(1):281-302, 1985

[22] Howie, J., *Minimal Seifert manifolds for higher ribbon knots*, In The Epstein birthday schrift, volume 1 of Geom. Topol. Monogr., pages 261-293 (electronic). Geom. Topol. Publ., Coventry, 1998

[23] Howie, J.M., *Fundamentals of Semigroup Theory*, Clarendon Press Oxford, (1995)

[24] Howie, J.M., Isbell, J. R., *Epimorphisms and Dominions II*, J. Algebra 6, 7-21, (1967)

[25] Huck, G., Rosebrock, S., *Aspherical labelled oriented trees and knots*, Proceedings of the Edinburgh Mathematical Society (2001) 44, 285-294

[26] Huebschmann, J., *Aspherical 2-complexes and an unsettled problem of J. H. C. Whitehead*, Math. Ann., 258(1):17-37, 1981/82.

[27] Isbell, J.R., *Epimorphisms and dominions*, in Proc. of the Conference on Categorical Algebra, La Jolla 1965 (S. Eilenberg et al, ed.), Lange and Springer, New York, 1966, pp. 232-246, MR 35:105a

[28] Ivanov, S., *Some Remarks on the Asphericity Whitehead Conjecture*, Illinois J., Math., Vol. 43, Nr. 4, (1999)

[29] Ivanov, S., *An Asphericity Conjecture and Kaplansky Problem on Zero Divisors*, J. of Algebra 216, 13-19, (1999)

[30] Ivanov, S., *On the asphericity of LOT-presentations of groups*, J. Group Theory 8 (2005), 135-138

[31] Norrie, K., *Actions and Automorphisms of Crossed Modules*, Bull. Soc. Math. France, 118, p. 129-146, (1990)

[32] Papakyriakopoulos, C., D., *Attaching 2-dimensional cells to a complex*, Ann. of Math. Vol. 78, N. 2, 205-222, (1963)

[33] Pride, S.J., *Identities among relations of group presentations*, in Group Theory from a Geometrical Viewpoint, World Scientific Publishing, Co, Pte, Ltd., (1991)

[34] Rosebrock, S., *The Whitehead conjecture-an overview*, Siberian Electronic Mathematical Reports, Tom 4, cmp. 440-449 (2007)

[35] Stefan, P., *On Peiffer transformations, link diagrams and a question of J. H. C. Whitehead, in Low-dimensional Topology*, Proc. Bangor Symp., 1979, Ed. R. Brown and T. L. Thickstun, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Series, Cambridge University Press, (1981)

[36] Whitehead, J.H.C., *On adding relations to homotopy groups*, Ann. of Math. 42, 409-428, (1941)